arXiv:1408.0943v2 [cs.DM] 25 Aug 2014

On MultiAspect Graphs

Klaus Wehmuth
National Laboratory for Scientific Computing (LNCC)
Av. Getúlio Vargas, 333
25651-075 – Petrópolis, RJ – Brazil
klaus@lncc.br

Éric Fleury
LIP – UMR CNRS 5668
Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon (ENS de Lyon) / INRIA
46, alleé d'Italie 69364
Lyon Cedex 07, France
eric.fleury@ens-lyon.fr

Artur Ziviani
National Laboratory for Scientific Computing (LNCC)
Av. Getúlio Vargas, 333
25651-075 – Petrópolis, RJ – Brazil
ziviani@lncc.br

Abstract

Different graph generalizations have been recently used in an ad-hoc manner to represent multilayer networks, i.e. systems formed by distinct layers where each layer can be seen as a network. Similar constructions have also been used to represent time-varying networks. We introduce the concept of MultiAspect Graph (MAG) as a graph generalization that we prove to be isomorphic to a directed graph, and also capable of representing all these previous generalizations. In our proposal, the set of vertices, layers, time instants, or any other independent feature is considered as an *aspect* of the MAG. For instance, a MAG is able to represent multilayer or time-varying networks, while both concepts can also be combined to represent a multilayer time-varying network. Since the MAG structure admits an arbitrary (finite) number of aspects, it hence introduces a powerful modelling abstraction for networked complex systems. This paper formalizes the concept of MAG and then derives theoretical results that can be useful in the analysis of complex networked systems modelled using the proposed MAG abstraction.

1 Introduction

Many graph generalizations have been proposed in the related literature, e.g. multigraphs and hypergraphs [1], with the purpose of representing multiple connections between vertices. In particular, k-uniform hypergraphs are sometimes referred to as k-graphs or generalized graphs [2, 3, 4].

More recently, other graph generalizations have been proposed for modelling systems that are described as the conjunction of distinct networks, where each of these networks can be seen as distinct layers, each of which can be represented by an independent graph. These generalizations, usually known as either multilayer and multiplex networks [5, 6, 7, 8], propose structures where (some) vertices are connected in distinct layers. As an example, consider an urban multi-modal public transportation system. This system can be modelled by distinct layers, such as the bus network, the tramway network, the subway network, the commuter rail network, and so on. Note that, in such an arrangement, each layer can be modelled by an independent graph and some vertices (i.e., bus and tramway stops; commuter rail and metro stations) may be shared by distinct layers, thus joining the whole system. Similar graph generalizations have been proposed for time-varying networks [9, 10, 11, 12], where the structure of the network varies in time. Although these models are in use for some time, they are not general enough to be able to combine these two features and represent a time-varying multilayer network. An example of such network is a transportation system, where as before, the layers represent the distinct transportation modes, the vertices are the stops and in addition, the time may be added to represent the service schedule. In this network, an edge is constructed by six parameters, two representing vertices, two representing layers, and two representing time instants. For instance, a bus leaving the bus stop b_1 at time t_a and arriving to the stop b_2 at time t_b can be represented by the edge $(b_1, bus, t_a, b_2, bus, t_b)$. There is a lack of a formal unified representation for such complex networked systems.

In this paper, we formalize the concept of MultiAspect Graph (MAG) as a further generalization able to represent multilayer and time-varying networks, as well as time-varying multilayer networks. A similar idea was recently discussed in [13], whereas without a thorough formalization. In a MAG, the set of vertices, layers, time instants, or any other independent feature, is considered as an *aspect*. On a MAG with p aspects, an edge is a $2p$-tuple, formed by two elements of each aspect, grouped in two parts, each containing one element of each aspect. For instance, a multilayer network can be represented by a MAG with 2 aspects, the first being the set of vertices and the second the set of layers. Each edge in this example is a quadruple, containing 2 vertices and 2 layers. Note that a time-varying multilayer network, such as the previously discussed multimodal transportation

system, is actually a MAG with three aspects.

The structure of a MAG is similar to an even uniform hypergraph [14]. Nevertheless, the additional structure imposed upon the way an edge is constructed on a MAG stems from its intended application of representing networks with more than one set of independent objects (aspects), as for instance, the previously mentioned multilayer or time-varying networks.

We formally define a MAG and its basic properties. The key contribution of this paper is to show that a MAG is closely related to a traditional oriented graph. This relation can be used to analyze properties and applications of the MAG concept on network analysis. It is our intent to make this work accessible to a broader audience, which might be interested in modelling and analyzing complex networked systems, where the MAG formalization introduced in this paper can prove helpful. Consequently, we adopt a relatively verbose proof style in an effort to increase the readability by a broader audience.

The remainder of this work is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the concept of a MultiAspect Graph (MAG). The main properties of a MAG are derived in Section 3. Section 4 concludes the paper and discusses possible future works.

2 MultiAspect Graph (MAG)

In this section, we introduce the concept of a MultiAspect Graph (MAG).

2.1 MAG definition

We define a MAG as $H = (A, E)$, where E is a set of edges and A is a finite list of sets, each of which is called an *aspect*. Each aspect $\sigma \in A$ is a finite set, and the number of aspects $p = |A|$ is called the order of H. Each edge $e \in E$ is a tuple with $2 \times p$ elements. All edges are constructed so that they are of the form $(a_1, \ldots, a_p, b_1, \ldots, b_p)$, where a_1, b_1 are elements of the first aspect of H, a_2, b_2 are elements of the second aspect of H, and so on, until a_p, b_p which are elements of the p-th aspect of H.

As a matter of notation, we say that $A(H)$ is the aspect list of H and $E(H)$ is the edge set of H. Further, $A(H)[n]$ is the n-th aspect in $A(H)$, $|A(H)[n]| = \tau_n$ is the number of elements in $A(H)[n]$, and $|A(H)|$ is the order of H. We adopt the convention of calling the elements of the first aspect of a MAG as vertices, and also, the convention of calling the first p entries of the edge e as the origin elements of e, and the last p entries as the destination elements of the edge e. Further, we define the following two sets constructed from the cartesian products of aspects of

an order p MAG:

$$\mathbb{V}(H) = \bigtimes_{n=1}^{p} A(H)[n], \tag{1}$$

the cartesian product of all the aspects of the MAG H, and

$$\mathbb{E}(H) = \bigtimes_{n=1}^{2p} A(H)[(n-1)(mod\ p)+1], \tag{2}$$

which is the set of all possible edges in the MAG H, so that $E(H) \subseteq \mathbb{E}(H)$.

We call $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ a *composite vertex* of MAG H. As a matter of notation, a composite vertex is always represented as a bold lowercase letter, as in $\mathbf{u}$, for instance. By construction, a pair $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})$ of composite vertices is closely related to an edge $e \in \mathbb{E}(H)$. In fact, it can be seen that for every edge $e \in \mathbb{E}(H)$ there are two composite vertices $\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ such that the entries of $\mathbf{u}$ match the origin elements of e and the entries of $\mathbf{v}$ match the destination elements of e. From this, for an edge $e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$ we can define the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_o : \mathbb{E}(H) &\to \mathbb{V}(H) \\ e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) &\mapsto (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

which maps the origin elements of an edge to a composite vertex, and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_d : \mathbb{E}(H) &\to \mathbb{V}(H) \\ e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) &\mapsto (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

which maps the destination elements of an edge to a composite vertex. Based on these two functions, we also define the bijective function

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \mathbb{E}(H) &\to \mathbb{V}(H) \bigtimes \mathbb{V}(H) \\ e &\mapsto (\pi_o(e), \pi_d(e)) = ((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Similarly to a simple graph, we do not allow the presence of self-loop edges on a MAG, i.e. for any MAG H, if $e_\ell \in \mathbb{E}(H)$ is a self-loop edge, then $e_\ell \notin E(H)$. In a MAG, a self-loop edge is an edge $e_\ell \in \mathbb{E}(H)$, such that $\pi_o(e_\ell) = \pi_d(e_\ell)$.

Further, since on an order p MAG an edge is a tuple with $2 \times p$ elements, we also define $2 \times p$ canonical projections, where each of those projections maps an

edge to one of its elements:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_n : E(H) &\to A(H)[n] \\ (a_1,\ldots,a_p,b_1,\ldots,b_p) &\mapsto a_n, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{p+n} : E(H) &\to A(H)[n] \\ (a_1,\ldots,a_p,b_1,\ldots,b_p) &\mapsto b_n. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We also use the projections π_1 to π_p defined above to recover each of the values that compose the p-tuple which characterizes a composite vertex. This is an abuse of notation, since the domain of these projections is a set of edges instead of a set of composite vertices, but the intuition and readability gained with this notation justifies its use.

A possible use for MAGs is to provide a model for representing multilayer [7] or time-varying networks [12]. MAGs, however, also enable even further generalizations, such as combining these two concepts to represent time-varying multilayer networks. To illustrate these possible uses, we present a few simple examples of such objects with orders ranging from 1 to 3, highlighting that higher orders are though possible.

First, consider the case of an order 1 MAG. An illustrative example of this object is

$$H_a = (A_a = [\{a_1,a_2,a_3\}], E_a = \{(a_1,a_2),(a_2,a_1),(a_1,a_3)\}).$$

Since H_a has only a single aspect, it is equivalent to a traditional directed graph, the only difference being that instead of a node set, H_a has a list which contains the node set. In this case, we have that $\mathbb{V}(H_a) = \{a_1,a_2,a_3\}$ and $\mathbb{E}(H_a) = \{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{a_1,a_2,a_3\}$.

Second, consider the following two illustrative examples of order 2 MAGs:

$$H_b = (A_b = [\{a_1,a_2,a_3\},\{l_a,l_b,l_c\}], E_b = \{(a_1,l_c,a_2,l_c),(a_2,l_a,a_1,l_a),(a_1,l_b,a_3,l_b)\}),$$

representing a multilayer network with 3 vertices and 3 layers, having one edge at each of its layers. For this MAG, $\mathbb{V}(H_b) = \{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{l_a,l_b,l_c\}$ and $\mathbb{E}(H_b) = \{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{l_a,l_b,l_c\} \times \{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{l_a,l_b,l_c\}$. Similarly, consider the order 2 MAG:

$$H_c = (A_c = [\{a_1,a_2,a_3\},\{t_1,t_2\}], E_c = \{(a_1,t_1,a_2,t_1),(a_2,t_2,a_1,t_2),(a_1,t_2,a_3,t_2)\}),$$

representing a time-varying network with 3 vertices and 2 time instants, having one edge at time instant t_1 and 2 edges at time instant t_2. For this MAG, $\mathbb{V}(H_c) =$

$\{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{t_1,t_2\}$ and $\mathbb{E}(H_c) = \{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{t_1,t_2\} \times \{a_1,a_2,a_3\} \times \{t_1,t_2\}$. Note that for order 2 MAGs the composite vertices are ordered pairs and the edges are ordered quadruples.

From these illustrative examples, it can be seen that a MAG of order 3 could be used to represent a time-varying multilayer network, by having one aspect representing nodes, one representing layers, and finally one representing time instants. In such a MAG, a composite vertex is an ordered triple, whereas an edge is an ordered sextuple. Although such an object can be constructed as an even uniform hypergraph, the edge structure would not be enforced by the hypergraph. Further, since the aspect notion emerges naturally from the modelled system, it is straightforward to use it in order to retain the association between the model and the modelled system. Moreover, during the development of this paper, we show that it is relevant to know the number of elements in each aspect. This could be difficult on a hypergraph in the case where the intersection of the aspects is not empty. Therefore, even though a MAG can be seen as a particular case of an even uniform hypergraph, it is useful to adopt our proposed definition and the additional information contained in it.

2.2 Aspect sub-determination

The sub-determination of the composite vertices in a MAG H partitions $\mathbb{V}(H)$ into equivalence classes considering only a partial aspect sublist. As a consequence, the sub-determination of the composite vertices leads to edge and MAG sub-determinations. For instance, the traditional aggregated direct graph, commonly found in the time-varying graph literature, is a particular case of MAG sub-determination. We detail this in the following subsections.

2.2.1 Sub-determined composite vertices

On a given MAG H, we use a nonempty proper sublist[1] of the aspects of the MAG to characterize an equivalence class, which is then used to partition the set of composite vertices.

For a MAG H of order p, there are $2^p - 1$ proper sublists of $A(H)$. As we require the sublist of aspects used to characterize an equivalence class to be nonempty, it follows that it can be characterized in $2^p - 2$ distinct ways. For each of these $2^p - 2$ ways, we have a list $A_C(H) \subset A(H)$ of the aspects used to determine an equivalence class. Note that in a MAG of order $p = 1$ (i.e. a traditional graph), a vertex can not be sub-determined, since $2^p - 2 = 0$.

[1] A proper sublist of a given list L is a sublist which is strictly contained in L and so necessarily excludes at least one member of L.

Let ζ, with $1 \leqslant \zeta \leqslant 2^p - 2$, be an index for one of the possible ways to construct a proper nonempty sublist of aspects. For each ζ, we have a unique sublist $A_{C_\zeta}(H)$ of aspects, such that $p_\zeta = |A_{C_\zeta}(H)|$ is the order of the sub-determination ζ. We now define the set

$$\mathbb{V}_\zeta(H) = \bigtimes_{n=1}^{p_\zeta} A_{C_\zeta}(H)[n], \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbb{V}_\zeta(H)$ is the cartesian product of all the aspects in the sublist $A_{C_\zeta}(H)$ of aspects, according to the index ζ. We call $\mathbf{u}_\zeta \in \mathbb{V}_\zeta(H)$ a sub-determined vertex, according to the sub-determination ζ.

We can now define the function

$$\begin{aligned} S_\zeta : \mathbb{V}(H) &\to \mathbb{V}_\zeta(H) \\ (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p) &\mapsto (a_{\zeta_1}, a_{\zeta_2}, \ldots, a_{\zeta_m}), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

which maps a composite vertex $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ to the corresponding sub-determined composite vertex $\mathbf{u}_\zeta \in \mathbb{V}_\zeta(H)$, according to the sub-determination ζ. As $(a_{\zeta_1}, a_{\zeta_2}, \ldots, a_{\zeta_m}) \in \mathbb{V}_\zeta(H)$, it follows that $a_{\zeta_1} \in A_{C_\zeta}(H)[1], \ldots, a_{\zeta_m} \in A_{C_\zeta}(H)[m]$. From the definition, it can be seen that the function S_ζ : is not injective. Hence, the function S_ζ for a given sub-determination can be used to define a equivalence relation $\equiv$ in $\mathbb{V}(H)$, where for any given composite vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, we have that $\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{v}$ if and only if $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{v})$.

2.2.2 Sub-determined edges

From the sub-determination ζ of order p_ζ, we can also construct the set

$$\mathbb{E}_\zeta(H) = \bigtimes_{n=1}^{2 \times p_\zeta} A_{C_\zeta}(H)[(n-1)(mod\ p_\zeta) + 1], \tag{10}$$

where $p_\zeta = |A_{C_\zeta}(H)|$ is the order of the sub-determination ζ, and $\mathbb{E}_\zeta(H)$ is the set of all possible sub-determined edges according to ζ. We then define the function

$$\begin{aligned} E_\zeta : \mathbb{E}(H) &\to \mathbb{E}_\zeta(H) \\ (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) &\mapsto (a_{\zeta_1}, a_{\zeta_2}, \ldots, a_{\zeta_m}, b_{\zeta_1}, b_{\zeta_2}, \ldots, b_{\zeta_m}), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $a_{\zeta_1}, b_{\zeta_1} \in A_{C_\zeta}(H)[1], a_{\zeta_2}, 2_{\zeta_2} \in A_{C_\zeta}(H)[2], \ldots, a_{\zeta_m}, b_{\zeta_m} \in A_{C_\zeta}(H)[m]$. This function takes an edge to its sub-determined form according to ζ in a similar way as defined above for composite vertices. In general, the function E_ζ is not injective. Consider two distinct edges $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$, such that e_1 and e_2 differ only in aspects which are not in $A_{C_\zeta}(H)$. Since $E_\zeta(\cdot)$ only contains values for aspects

present in $A_{C_\zeta}(H)$, it follows that $E_\zeta(e_1) = E_\zeta(e_2)$, and therefore E_ζ is not injective. Further, consider an edge $e \in E(H)$ and its sub-determined edge $e_\zeta = E_\zeta(e)$, such that $\pi_o(e_\zeta) = \pi_d(e_\zeta)$, i.e. e_ζ is a self-loop. Since self-loops are not allowed to be present on a MAG, it follows that $e_\zeta \notin E_\zeta(E(H))$. As consequence, we have that $|E_\zeta(E(H))| \leqslant |E(H)|$.

2.2.3 Sub-determined MAGs

For a given sub-determination ζ we have the sublist $A_{C_\zeta}(H)$ of considered aspects and also the sub-determined edges obtained from ζ. Based on them, we can now obtain a sub-determined MAG. For a given sub-determination ζ we define the function

$$\begin{aligned} M_\zeta : (A(H), E(H)) &\to (A_{C_\zeta}(H), \mathbb{E}_\zeta(H)) \\ H &\mapsto (A_{C_\zeta}(H), E_\zeta(E(H))). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Since $A_{C_\zeta}(H)$ is the sublist of aspects of H prescribed by ζ and $E_\zeta(E(H))$ is the set of all sub-determined edges according to the sub-determination ζ, it follows that $(A_{C_\zeta}(H), E_\zeta(E(H)))$ is a MAG obtained from H according to the sub-determination ζ. As $|A_{C_\zeta}(H)| < |A(H)|$, it follows that the order of $M_\zeta(H)$ is lower than the order of H. Further, since self-loops may be created by edge sub-determination and discarded, and also since E_ζ is not injective, it follows that $|E_\zeta(E(H))| \leqslant |E(H)|$.

2.2.4 Aggregated directed graph

The concept of aggregated graph is usually found in the literature associated with time-varying or multilayer networks. In these environments, it consists of ignoring the time and layer aspects while projecting all edges over the vertices set. Since MAGs can be used to represent time-varying and multilayer graphs, we present a similar concept extended to the MAG environment.

The aggregated graph associated with a MAG is a directed graph created by a particular case of MAG sub-determination, ζ_1, where $A_{C_{\zeta_1}}(H) = [A(H)[1]]$, the sublist of H which contains only the first aspect of the MAG H. In this case, for a given MAG H with p aspects, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\zeta_1} : \mathbb{E}(H) &\to A(H)[1] \bigtimes A(H)[1] \\ (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) &\mapsto (a_1, b_1), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $a_1, b_1 \in A(H)[1]$, and

$$M_{\zeta_1} : (A(H), E(H)) \to ([A(H)[1]], A(H)[1] \bigtimes A(H)[1]) \qquad (14)$$
$$H \mapsto ([A(H)[1]], E_{\zeta_1}(E(H))).$$

Note that $M_{\zeta_1}(H)$ is an order 1 MAG, and also, according to our convention that $A(H)[1]$ is considered to be the vertex set of the MAG H, it follows that $M_{\zeta_1}(H)$ is equivalent to a directed graph, since every $a \in A(H)[1]$ is a vertex, and for every $e \in E_{\zeta_1}(E(H))$ we have that e is the sub-determination of and edge in H, and also that $e \in A(H)[1] \times A(H)[1]$.

3 MAG properties

In this section, we derive the main properties of a MAG as follows. Section 3.1 discusses isomorphisms between MAGs. Section 3.2 presents isomorphisms between MAGs and traditional directed graphs. The theoretical results obtained in Section 3.2 are key for the subsequent subsections, where the relation between MAGs and directed graphs is further explored. Section 3.3 defines the concept of degree on a MAG. Section 3.4 explores adjacency on MAGs and its relation to adjacency in directed graphs. Section 3.5 discusses the relations between walks, trails, paths, and cycles on a MAG and on a traditional directed graph. Sections 3.6 to 3.8 discuss shortest paths and distances on MAGs.

3.1 MAG isomorphism

Two MAGs of order p, H and K, are isomorphic if $p = |A(H)| = |A(K)|$, and there are p bijective functions $f_n : A(H)[n] \to A(K)[n]$ such that $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$ if and only if $(f_1(a_1), \ldots, f_p(a_p), f_1(b_1), \ldots, f_p(b_p)) \in E(K)$, where $a_1, b_1 \in A(H)[1]$, $a_2, b_2 \in A(H)[2], \ldots, a_p, b_p \in A(H)[p]$.

Since the MAG isomorphism is an equivalence relation, the set of all MAGs isomorphic to a given MAG H form an equivalence class in the set of all MAGs. This equivalence relation partitions the set of all MAGs. Further, since the functions f_p are bijections, it follows that if two MAGs H and K are isomorphic, they necessarily are of the same order, and each pair of aspects in H and K has the same number of elements, i.e. $|A(H)| = |A(K)|$ and $|A(H)[n]| = |A(K)[n]|$, for all $0 < n \leqslant p$. From the requirement that an edge $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p))$ exists in H if and only if the edge $(f(a_1), f_2(a_2), \ldots, f_p(a_p), f(b_1), f_2(b_2), \ldots, f_p(b_p))$ exists in K, it can be seen that two isomorphic MAGs also have the same number of edges, i.e. $|E(H)| = |E(K)|$.

In general, a given aspect $a_n \in A(H)$ is not an ordered set. However, if there is a subset $A_o \subseteq A(H)$ and a subset $B_o \subseteq A(K)$ for which every aspect $a_w \in A_o$ and every aspect $b_w \in B_o$ is a partially ordered set (poset), the MAG isomorphism as defined here does not necessarily preserve such order.

Given that $|A_o| = |B_o|$ and that for every $a_w \in A_o$ there is a $b_w \in B_o$ such that $|a_w| = |b_w|$, it is possible to obtain an order preserving isomorphism by requiring that every bijection $f_w : a_w \to b_w$ to be order preserving.

3.2 Isomorphism between MAGs and directed graphs

We say a MAG H is isomorphic to a traditional directed graph G when there is a bijective function $f : \mathbb{V}(H) \to V(G)$, such that an edge $e \in E(H)$ if and only if the edge $(f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e))) \in E(G)$.

Theorem 1. *For every MAG H of order $p > 0$, where all aspects are non-empty sets, there is a unique (up to a graph isomorphism) directed graph G with $\prod_{n=1}^{p} \tau_n$ vertices which is isomorphic to the MAG H. Note that $\tau_n = |A(H)[n]|$ is the number of elements on the n-th aspect of H.*

Proof. We show that for any such MAG H there is a unique (up to a graph isomorphism) directed graph with $\prod_{n=1}^{p} \tau_n$ vertices for which there is a bijective function $f : \mathbb{V}(H) \to V(G)$, such that any edge $e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$ if and only if $(f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e))) = (f((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p)), f((b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p))) \in E(G)$.

- Existence of G:
  Given the MAG H, we construct a directed graph G which satisfies the isomorphism conditions. We start with a directed graph G with $\prod_{n=1}^{p} \tau_n$ vertices and no edges. Note that the number of vertices in G equals the number of composite vertices in H, i.e. $|V(G)| = |\mathbb{V}(H)| = \prod_{n=1}^{p} \tau_n$. We then take an arbitrary bijective function $f : \mathbb{V}(H) \to V(G)$. Since the sets $V(G)$ and $\mathbb{V}(H)$ have the same number of elements, such bijection exits. Finally, for every edge $e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$ we add an edge $(f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e)))$ to $E(G)$. Since f is injective, it follows that if $\pi_o(e) \neq \pi_d(e)$ then $f(\pi_o(e)) \neq f(\pi_d(e))$. Therefore, each distinct edge $e \in E(H)$ is mapped to a distinct edge $(f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e))) \in E(G)$. As the only edges in $E(G)$ are the ones mapped from $E(H)$, it follows that the edge $e \in E(H)$ if and only if the edge $(f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e))) \in E(G)$, as required. Note that, as a consequence, we have that $|E(H)| = |E(G)|$. This gives us a directed graph G and a bijective function f that satisfies the isomorphism requirements. Therefore, we have shown that the required directed graph G exists.

- Uniqueness of G:
  Let's assume that in addition to the MAG H, the directed graph G, and the bijective function f described above, we also have another directed graph J with $\prod_{n=1}^{p} \tau_n$ vertices and a bijective function $j : \mathbb{V}(H) \to V(J)$, such that any edge $e \in E(H)$ if and only if the edge $(j(\pi_o(e)), j(\pi_d(e))) \in E(J)$. Since both f and j are bijective functions, it follows that the composite function $(j \circ f^{-1}) : V(G) \to V(J)$ is also a bijection. Further, from the definitions of f and j, it follows that the vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ are adjacent in G if and only if the vertices $(j \circ f^{-1})(u), (j \circ f^{-1})(v) \in V(J)$ are adjacent in J. The converse follows from the same argument applied to an edge in $E(J)$. Therefore, G and J are isomorphic directed graphs, and thus G is unique up to a graph isomorphism.

Given the existence and uniqueness of the directed graph G, the existence of the function f, and since H is an arbitrary MAG, we conclude that the theorem holds. □

As a matter of notation, hereafter we use e to refer to MAG edges and s to refer to traditional directed graph edges.

Corollary 1. *Given a MAG H and a directed graph G isomorphic to H, there is a bijective function from $E(H)$ to $E(G)$, built upon the isomorphism characterised by the bijection f, and which takes each edge $e \in E(H)$ to its corresponding edge $s \in E(G)$.*

Proof. Let H be a MAG and G a directed graph isomorphic to H. Since H and G are isomorphic, an edge e belongs to $E(H)$ if and only if a corresponding edge $s = (f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e)))$ belongs to $E(G)$, and the function f is a bijection from $\mathbb{V}(H)$ to $V(G)$. Consider the following function

$$\begin{aligned} h : E(H) &\to E(G) \\ e &\mapsto (f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e))). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

First, note that h is indeed a function, since it has a properly defined domain $E(H)$, codomain $E(G)$, and association rule $e \mapsto (f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e)))$. Further, note that this association rule is valid since for each $e \in E(H)$ there is an element $s \in E(G)$ such that $s = h(e)$. This is true because since H and G are isomorphic, it follows that if $e \in E(H)$ then $s = (f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e))) \in E(G)$. Furthermore, note that h is defined in terms of the bijection f used to construct the isomorphism between H and G and also that h associates each edge of H with the edge in G corresponding to it in accordance with the isomorphism between H and G.

We now show that the function h is injective. Let $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$. We intend to show that if $h(e_1) = h(e_2)$ then $e_1 = e_2$. Assuming that $h(e_1) = h(e_2)$, then $(f(\pi_o(e_1)), f(\pi_d(e_1))) = (f(\pi_o(e_2)), f(\pi_d(e_2)))$, so that $f(\pi_o(e_1)) = f(\pi_o(e_2))$ and $f(\pi_d(e_1)) = f(\pi_d(e_2))$. Since f is bijective, it follows that $\pi_o(e_1) = \pi_o(e_2)$ and $\pi_d(e_1) = \pi_d(e_2)$. Therefore, $e_1 = e_2$ and so h is injective.

Further, we show that h is surjective. Let $s \in G$ be any edge in the directed graph G. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $s = (u, v)$, where $u, v \in V(G)$ are vertices of the directed graph G. Since G is isomorphic to H, it follows that there is an edge $e \in E(H)$, such that $u = f(\pi_o(e))$ and $v = f(\pi_d(e))$. Then, by the definition of h, it follows that $s = (u, v) = h(e) = (f(\pi_o(e)), f(\pi_d(e)))$. Therefore, for any given edge $s \in E(G)$, there is an edge $e \in E(H)$ such that $s = h(e)$, and so h is a surjective function.

Since the function h associates each edge $e \in E(H)$ with its corresponding edge $s \in G$, and h is both injective and surjective, the corollary holds. □

Theorem 1 as well as Corolary 1 represent an important theoretical result because this allows the use of the isomorphic directed graph as a tool to analyze both the properties of a MAG and the behavior of dynamic processes over a MAG.

3.2.1 Order preserving isomorphism

From the MAG definition used in this work, we have that the aspects are not required to be ordered sets. As a consequence, the isomorphism defined in Theorem 1 does not necessarily preserves aspect ordering. If, however, a sublist of the aspects on the MAG can support order, it is possible to obtain an isomorphism to a directed graph that preserves order. This can be achieved by imposing additional requirements to the involved sets and functions as shown next.

First, given an order p MAG H, we need a sublist $P(H) = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_j)$, where every p_n in $P(H)$ is an aspect in $A(H)$, such that the set $T_P(H) = p_1 \times p_2 \times \ldots \times p_j$ admits a partial or total order relation. Our goal is to obtain an isomorphism that preserves the order defined in $T_P(H)$.

Note that by the construction of $T_P(H)$, for any composite vertex $\mathbf{u} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p) \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, there is a tuple $t = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_j) \in T_P(H)$ such that t is a sublist of $\mathbf{u}$. This happens because every set in the cartesian product that forms $T_P(H)$ is also in the cartesian product that forms $\mathbb{V}(H)$. Therefore, we can define the function

$$\begin{aligned} p : \mathbb{V}(H) &\to T_P(H) \\ (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p) &\mapsto (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_j). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

This function p can also be constructed from a subset of the projections π_n defined in Section 2, i.e. for a proper $n_a, n_b, \ldots, n_j$ and any given composite vertex $\mathbf{u} \in$

$\mathbb{V}(H)$, we have that $p(\mathbf{u}) = (\pi_{n_a}(\mathbf{u}), \pi_{n_b}(\mathbf{u}), \ldots, \pi_{n_j}(\mathbf{u}))$.

Using the function p defined above, we can now construct an equivalence relation $\sim$ in $\mathbb{V}(H)$, such that for any given $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v}$ if and only if $p(\mathbf{u}) = p(\mathbf{v})$. Let $\mathbb{T}(H)$ be the set of equivalence classes generated by $\sim$ on $\mathbb{V}(H)$. By construction, each equivalence class $\Gamma \in \mathbb{T}(H)$ has the same number of elements, i.e. $|\Gamma| = |\mathbb{V}(H)|/|T_P(H)|$, and also there are $|T_P(H)|$ equivalence classes in $\mathbb{T}(H)$. Since $|T_P(H)| = |\mathbb{T}(H)|$ the same order defined for $T_P(H)$ can now be applied to $\mathbb{T}(H)$, making it a poset.

Second, we define a partition on the set $V(G)$ that has $|\mathbb{T}(H)|$ equivalence classes and each equivalence class contains $|\mathbb{V}(H)|/|T_P(H)|$ elements. This is possible since $|V(G)| = |\mathbb{V}(H)|$. Let $\mathbb{T}(G)$ be the set of equivalence classes in this partition. Note that $|\mathbb{T}(G)| = |\mathbb{T}(H)|$. We then define an order over $\mathbb{T}(G)$, which is consistent with the order defined for $\mathbb{T}(H)$. This makes $\mathbb{T}(G)$ a poset and establishes an equivalence relation on $V(G)$, which we denote by $\approx$.

Finally, we define a bijection $f : \mathbb{V}(H) \to V(G)$, which not only satisfies the condition for isomorphism, but also is consistent with the partitions constructed in $\mathbb{V}(H)$ and $V(G)$ as well as preserves the order of these partitions.

It remains to be shown that such an order preserving isomorphism in fact exists. We do this by example, showing that the natural isomorphism defined next in Section 3.2.2 is in fact an order preserving isomorphism.

3.2.2 Natural isomorphism

A special case can be constructed, which characterizes a natural isomorphism (i.e. a natural choice of isomorphism), by making the directed graph G such that its vertex set $V(G)$ is equal to the set $\mathbb{V}(H)$ and using the identity function $I : \mathbb{V}(H) \to V(G)$ as the bijective function to characterize the isomorphism.

Note that, in this case, the edges added to the graph G by the process described in Theorem 1 are such that for every edge $e \in E(H)$ an edge $(I(\pi_o(e)), I(\pi_d(e))) = (\pi_o(e), \pi_d(e)) \in E(G)$ exists in the directed graph G.

To see that the natural isomorphism is also an order preserving isomorphism, note that in this case $\mathbb{V}(H) = V(G)$ such that both sets can be partitioned in the same way and both partitions can be ordered in the same way. By doing this, the identity function naturally is consistent with the partitions and preserves order as required in Section 3.2.1.

3.2.3 MAG representation by composite vertices

In this section, we show that it is possible to create a representation of any given MAG using composite vertices. This is equivalent to the natural isomorphism be-

tween MAGs and directed graphs, presented in Section 3.2.2.

From the definition of composite vertices, we have that given an order p MAG H, a composite vertex is defined as $\mathbf{u} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p) \in \mathbb{V}(H) = \times_{n=1}^{p} A(H)[n]$. Therefore, if $\mathbb{V}(H)$ is considered as the vertex set of a directed graph, it follows that an edge on this graph is an element of the set $\mathbb{V}(H) \times \mathbb{V}(H)$, which is an ordered pair of composite vertices. For instance, an edge between the composite vertices $\mathbf{u} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)$ is represented as the ordered pair $((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ of composite vertices.

In this environment, given a MAG H, it is straightforward to create a directed graph $G = (\mathbb{V}(H), E(G))$, where $\mathbb{V}(H)$ is the set of composite vertices, and $E(G)$ is obtained from the set $E(H)$ of edges of the MAG H, such that an edge $((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)) \in E(G)$ if and only if the edge $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$. Another way for obtaining the set $E(G)$ is by using the bijective function h defined in Corollary 1. Note that since in this environment the function f used to define the isomorphism between H and G is the identity function $I : \mathbb{V}(H) \to \mathbb{V}(H)$, we have that the function h related to the isomorphism between $E(H)$ and $E(G)$ (see Corollary 1, Equation 15) is written as

$$\begin{aligned} h_i : E(H) &\to E(G) \\ (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) &\mapsto ((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)), \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $E(G) \subseteq \mathbb{V}(H) \times \mathbb{V}(H)$. Here, h_i represents the particular case of h obtained by the natural isomorphism between H and G.

To see that the graph $G = (\mathbb{V}(H), E(G))$ is indeed the graph obtained by the natural isomorphism discussed in Section 3.2.2, note that we have the identity function $I : \mathbb{V}(H) \to \mathbb{V}(H)$, and that by the definition of the composite vertices representation, for all $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, the edge $((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p), (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)) \in E(G)$ if and only if the edge $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$. For any given MAG $H = (A, E)$, we can now define the function

$$\begin{aligned} g : ((A(H), E(H))) &\to (\mathbb{V}(H), E(G)) \\ H &\mapsto (I(\mathbb{V}(H)), h_i(E(H))), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

such that $g(H)$ is the composite vertices representation of the MAG H. Since the graph $g(H)$ is the same graph obtained by the natural isomorphism shown in Section 3.2.2, it follows that $g(H)$ is isomorphic to the MAG H.

3.3 Degree

The concept of degree in a graph is associated with the concept of vertex. In a MAG, it is associated with an aspect, of which, as per our convention, a vertex is a

special case. We therefore, define aspect and composite vertex degrees. Since the edges on a MAG are naturally directed, we adopt the same notation as in directed graphs of the indegree of a vertex u denoted as $deg^-(u)$ and the outdegree of a vertex u denoted as $deg^+(u)$.

3.3.1 Aspect degree

We define the aspect degree as the number of edges incident to a given element of an aspect. Since the edges are directed, we distinguish between indegree and outdegree. The formal definition of aspect degree can therefore, be written as

$$deg^+(a_i) = |\{e \in E(H) : \pi_i(e) = a_i\}|, \tag{19}$$
$$deg^-(a_i) = |\{e \in E(H) : \pi_{p+i}(e) = a_i\}|, \tag{20}$$

where $a_i \in A(H)[i]$ is an element of the i-th aspect of the MAG H, and π_i is the canonical projection onto aspect i defined in the beginning of Section 2. Therefore, $deg^+(a_i)$ is the number of edges originated at element a_i and $deg^-(a_i)$ is the number of edges destined to element a_i, noting that $a_i \in A(H)[i]$.

3.3.2 Composite vertex degree

We also consider the degree based on composite vertices. The composite vertex degree considers the degree of a vertex taking into account all the aspects present on the MAG. This follows directly from the definition of a composite vertex:

$$deg^+(\mathbf{u}) = |\{e \in E(H) : \pi_o(e) = \mathbf{u}\}|, \tag{21}$$
$$deg^-(\mathbf{u}) = |\{e \in E(H) : \pi_d(e) = \mathbf{u}\}|. \tag{22}$$

That is, $deg^+(\mathbf{u})$ is the number of edges originated at the composite vertex $\mathbf{u}$, while $deg^-(\mathbf{u})$ is the number of edges destined to the composite vertex $\mathbf{u}$.

3.4 Adjacency

The concept of adjacency in a MAG can be defined in terms of aspect, composite edges and edge adjacencies:

- *Aspect adjacency* establishes a relation between two elements of a same aspect, in which these elements are considered adjacent if and only if they share a common edge, i.e. a given edge is incident to both elements. In other words, in a given MAG H of order p, two aspect elements $a_n, b_n \in A(H)[n]$ are adjacent if and only if there is at least one edge $e \in E(H)$ such that

$a_n, b_n \in \{\pi_n(e), \pi_{p+n}(e)\}$. Note that by our convention of associate the first aspect of a MAG with vertices, if follows that aspect adjacency on the first aspect can be viewed as vertex adjacency.

- *Composite vertex adjacency* establishes a relation between composite vertices, i.e. a relation between vertices considering the values of every aspect on the edge. Composite vertices are considered adjacent if and only if they share a common edge. In a given MAG H of order p, two composite vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ are adjacent if and only if there is an edge $e \in E(H)$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \pi_o(e)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \pi_d(e)$.

- *Edge adjacency* defines an edge relation in which two MAG edges are considered adjacent if and only if they are incident to the same composite vertex. In a given MAG H of order p, two edges $e_a, e_b \in E(H)$ are adjacent if and only if there is a composite vertex $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, such that $\mathbf{u} \in \{\pi_o(e_a), \pi_d(e_a)\}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \{\pi_o(e_b), \pi_d(e_b)\}$.

In order to present the relations between the adjacency in a MAG and the adjacency in its isomorphic directed graph G, we introduce the following theorems.

Theorem 2. *Given a MAG H and a directed graph G isomorphic to H, a pair of composite vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ is adjacent in H if and only if their corresponding vertices in G are adjacent.*

Proof. Let H be a MAG, G a directed graph isomorphic to H, and $\mathbf{u} = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)$, $\mathbf{v} = (b_1, \ldots, b_p) \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ a pair of composite vertices in H.

Since the MAG H is isomorphic to the directed graph G, it follows from Theorem 1 that an edge $e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$ if and only if if the edge $s = (f((\pi_o(e))), f((\pi_d(e)))) \in E(G)$. Note that since $\mathbf{u} = \pi_o(e)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \pi_d(e)$, it follows that $s = (f(\mathbf{u}), f(\mathbf{v}))$. Further, from the composite vertex adjacency definition, we have that $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are adjacent in H if and only if $e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$. Therefore, $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are adjacent in H if and only if $(f(\mathbf{u}), f(\mathbf{v})) \in E(G)$. Since $f(\mathbf{u}) \in V(G)$ is the vertex corresponding to $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ and $f(\mathbf{v}) \in V(G)$ is the vertex corresponding to $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, the theorem holds. □

Theorem 3. *Given a MAG H of order p and a directed graph G isomorphic to H, a pair of aspect elements $a_n, b_n \in A(H)[n]$ is adjacent in H if and only if there is a pair of adjacent vertices $r, s \in V(G)$ in the graph G, such that r corresponds to a composite vertex $\mathbf{u}$ and s corresponds to a composite vertex $\mathbf{v}$ for which $a_n, b_n \in \{\pi_n(\mathbf{u}), \pi_{p+n}(\mathbf{v})\}$.*

Proof. Let H be a MAG, G a directed graph isomorphic to H, and $f : \mathbb{V}(H) \rightarrow V(G)$ the isomorphism characterising bijection.

- $\Longrightarrow$
  Let $a_n, b_n \in A(H)[n]$ be a pair of adjacent aspect elements in H. From the definition of aspect adjacency, there is an edge $e \in E(H)$, for which $a_n, b_n \in \{\pi_n(e), \pi_{p+n}(e)\}$. As $e \in E(H)$, it follows that $\mathbf{u} = \pi_o(e)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \pi_d(e)$ are adjacent composite vertices in H. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 2 that there is a pair of adjacent vertices $r, s \in V(G)$, such that $r = f(\mathbf{u})$ and $s = f(\mathbf{v})$.

- $\Longleftarrow$
  Let $r, s \in V(G)$ be a pair of adjacent vertices in G, such that $\mathbf{u} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, \ldots, a_p) = f^{-1}(r)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n, \ldots, b_p) = f^{-1}(s)$. It follows from Theorem 2 that $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are adjacent composite vertices in H, so that $e = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n, \ldots, b_p) \in E(H)$. Therefore, from the vertex adjacency definition, it follows that $a_n, b_n \in A(H)[n]$ are adjacent aspect elements in H.

□

Theorem 4. *For a given MAG H and a directed graph G isomorphic to H, a pair of edges in H is adjacent if and only if their corresponding edges are adjacent in G.*

Proof. Let H be a MAG and G its isomorphic directed graph according to Theorem 1.

- $\Longrightarrow$
  Let $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$ be two adjacent edges in H. Since they are adjacent, by our definition both edges are incident to the same composite vertex. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that $e_1 = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)$ and $e_2 = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p, c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_p)$, making both edges incident to the composite vertex $\mathbf{v} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)$.
  By Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, it follows that there are two edges $s_1, s_2 \in E(G)$, such that $s_1 = (f((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p)), f((b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)))$ and $s_2 = (f((b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)), f((c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_p)))$. Since both edges s_1 and s_2 are incident to the vertex $f((b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p)) \in V(G)$, they are adjacent edges in G.

- $\Longleftarrow$
  Let $s_3, s_4 \in E(G)$ be two adjacent edges in G. Since they are adjacent, they are incident to the same vertex and thus, without loss of generality, they can

be written as $s_3 = (a,b)$ and $s_4 = (b,c)$, where $a,b,c \in V(G)$ are vertices in G. Hence, by Theorem 1, $f^{-1}(a), f^{-1}(b), f^{-1}(c) \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ are composite vertices in H. By Corollary 1, $e_3 = (f^{-1}(a), f^{-1}(b))$ and $e_4 = (f^{-1}(b), f^{-1}(c))$ are edges in H. Since both edges are incident to the composite vertex $f^{-1}(b)$, it follows that they are adjacent edges in H.

□

Theorem 5. *Let H be a MAG of order p, ζ a sub-determination, and $e_a, e_b \in E(H)$, two edges such that $S_\zeta(\pi_o(e_a)) \neq S_\zeta(\pi_d(e_a))$ and $S_\zeta(\pi_o(e_b)) \neq S_\zeta(\pi_d(e_b))$ and $E_\zeta(e_a) \neq E_\zeta(e_b)$. If e_a and e_b are adjacent edges in H, then the sub-determined edges $E_\zeta(e_a)$ and $E_\zeta(e_b)$ are adjacent on the sub-determined MAG $M_\zeta(H)$.*

Proof. Since e_a and e_b are adjacent edges in H, it follows that they share a common composite vertex, and are therefore, incident to three distinct composite vertices. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ be the shared composite vertex, and $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ the other two composite vertices to which e_a and e_b are incident. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{u} = \pi_d(e_a) = \pi_o(e_b)$, $\mathbf{v} = \pi_o(e_a)$ and $\mathbf{w} = \pi_d(e_b)$. Since $E_\zeta(e_a) \neq E_\zeta(e_b)$, it follows that they are edges on $M_\zeta(H)$, i.e. $E_\zeta(e_a), E_\zeta(e_b) \in \mathbb{E}\zeta(H)$. Further, $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}) = S_\zeta(\pi_d(e_a)) = S_\zeta(\pi_o(e_b))$, $S_\zeta(\mathbf{v}) = S_\zeta(\pi_o(e_a))$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{w}) = S_\zeta(\pi_d(e_b))$. Therefore, $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u})$, $S_\zeta(\mathbf{v})$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{w})$ are three distinct composite vertices on $M_\zeta(H)$, so that $E_\zeta(e_a)$ and $E_\zeta(e_b)$ are adjacent, since $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u})$ is a composite vertex shared by them. □

3.5 Walks, trails, paths, and cycles

3.5.1 Walk

We define a walk on a MAG H of order p as an alternating sequence $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, e_1, \mathbf{u}_2, e_2, \mathbf{u}_3, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, e_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ of composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ and edges $e_m \in E(H)$, such that $\mathbf{u}_n = \pi_o(e_n)$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n+1} = \pi_d(e_n)$ for $1 \leqslant n < k$. Note that from this definition we have that for all pairs of consecutive composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_m$ and $\mathbf{u}_{m+1}$, $1 \leqslant m \leqslant k$, are adjacent and also that for all pairs of consecutive edges e_j and e_{j+1},$1 \leqslant j < k$, are adjacent as well.

A walk is closed if $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_k$ and open otherwise. The set of composite vertices in the walk W is denoted as $V(W)$ and the set of edges in the walk W is denoted as $E(W)$. Since the edges in W contain elements of every aspect in $A(H)$, it follows that a walk has the same p aspects of the MAG H where the walk is defined, i.e. $|A(W)| = |A(H)|$. However, for each aspect $A(W)[n] \in A(W)$, we have that $A(W)[n] \subseteq A(H)[n]$, since not necessarily each element of a given aspect will be reached by the walk. Therefore, if W is a walk on a MAG H, then $V(W) \subseteq \mathbb{V}(H)$,

$E(W) \subseteq E(H)$, $|A(W)| = |A(H)|$, and $A(W)[n] \subseteq A(H)[n]$ for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant p$, where $p = |A(W)| = |A(H)|$ is the order of both W and H.

Note that each edge e_n in a walk W can be determined from the composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_n$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n+1}$ by writing $e_n = (\pi_1(\mathbf{u}_n), \pi_2(\mathbf{u}_n), \ldots, \pi_p(\mathbf{u}_n), \pi_1(\mathbf{u}_{n+1}), \pi_2(\mathbf{u}_{n+1}), \ldots, \pi_p(\mathbf{u}_{n+1}))$, so that $\mathbf{u}_n = \pi_o(e_n)$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n+1} = \pi_d(e_n)$. Therefore, W can be fully described by the sequence of its composite vertices, $W_V = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, ..., \mathbf{u}_k]$. We may refer to a walk using this notation in cases where the precise determination of the edges is not needed. The sequence of composite vertices W_V is not necessarily equal to the set $V(W)$ of composite vertices in the walk, since in W_V there may be repeated composite vertices.

Further, each edge e_j in a walk W also fully determines the composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{u}_{j+1}$, since $\mathbf{u}_j = \pi_o(e_j)$ and $\mathbf{u}_{j+1} = \pi_d(e_j)$. Hence, W can also be determined by its sequence of edges $W_E = [e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{k-1}]$. We may use this notation when the precise identification of the composite vertices is not needed. The sequence of edges W_E is not necessarily equal to the set of edges $E(W)$, since there may be repeated edges in W_E. The length of a walk is determined by the number of edges the walk contains, i.e. $Len(W) = |W_E|$.

As a short notation, in cases where there is no ambiguity, or the identity of the composite vertices and edges in the walk is irrelevant, we may also identify a walk W only by its starting and ending composite vertices as $W = \mathbf{u}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_k$.

Theorem 6. *An alternating sequence W of composite vertices and edges in a MAG H is a walk on H if and only if there is a corresponding walk G_W in the composite vertices representation of H.*

Proof. As stated in Section 3.2.3, for the composite vertices representation $g(H)$ of the MAG H, there is a bijective function $h_i : E(H) \rightarrow E(g(H))$ such that $h_i(e) = (\pi_o(e), \pi_d(e))$.

- $\Longrightarrow$
  Let $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, e_1, \mathbf{u}_2, e_2, \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, e_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ be a walk on MAG H and $g(H)$ be the composite vertices representation of H. Since the vertices present in W are composite vertices, they correspond directly to composite vertices in $g(H)$ because the bijection between $\mathbb{V}(H)$ and $V(g(H))$ is the identity. Thus, it is only necessary to translate the edges $e_n \in E(H)$ into edges $s_n \in E(g(H))$. Each edge $e_n \in E(W)$ of the walk W is determined by the composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_n$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n+1}$. Applying the function h_i to e_n we have that $h_i(e_n) = (\pi_o(e_n), \pi_d(e_n)) = (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{u}_{n+1}) = s_n$. Therefore, we have that the sequence $G_W = [\mathbf{u}_1, s_1, \mathbf{u}_2, s_2, \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, s_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ is the walk corresponding to W in $g(H)$, since it is the walk composed of the vertices in $V(g(H))$ corresponding to the composite vertices in W.

- $\Longleftarrow$

  Let $G_W = [\mathbf{u}_1, s_1, \mathbf{u}_2, s_2, \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1},\ s_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ be a walk on $g(H)$. Then $\mathbf{u}_n \in V(g(H))$ are vertices in $g(H)$ and $s_m \in E(g(H))$ are edges in $g(H)$. By construction of $g(H)$, $V(g(H)) = \mathbb{V}(H)$, such that $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ are also composite vertices in H. Since G_W is a walk on the graph $g(H)$, it follows that $s_n = (\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{u}_{n+1})$. Applying h_i^{-1} to s_n, we have $h_i^{-1}((\mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{u}_{n+1})) = (\pi_1(\mathbf{u}_n), \ldots, \pi_p(\mathbf{u}_n), \pi_1(\mathbf{u}_{n+1}), \ldots,\ \pi_p(\mathbf{u}_{n+1})) = e_n$, such that the sequence $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, e_1, \mathbf{u}_2, e_2,\ \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1},\ e_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ is the corresponding walk on the MAG H.

□

Corollary 2. *The length of a walk W on a MAG H is the same as the length of the corresponding walk G_W on the directed graph $g(H)$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 6 that the sequence of composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_n$ in the walk H is the same as the sequence of composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_m$ in the walk G_W. Since each pair of consecutive composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{u}_{j+1}$ determines an edge in W and also an edge in G_W, it follows that the number of edges in W is the same as the number of edges in G_W. Therefore, from the definition of length of a walk, we have that $Len(W) = Len(G_W)$, and then the corollary holds. □

Theorem 7. *Given a MAG H and a sub-determination ζ, the projection of a walk on H onto $M_\zeta(H)$ is a walk on $M_\zeta(H)$.*

Proof. Let H be a MAG of order p, $M_\zeta(H)$ a sub-determined MAG of H and $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, e_1,\ \mathbf{u}_2, e_2, \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1},\ e_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ a walk on MAG H. Consider $W_\zeta = [S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1), E_\zeta(e_1), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_2), E_\zeta(e_2), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_3), ..., S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_{k-1}), E_\zeta(e_{k-1}), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_k)]$. If all the edges $e_n \in E(W)$ are such that $S_\zeta(\pi_o(e_n)) \neq S_\zeta(\pi_d(e_n))$ and $E_\zeta(e_n) \neq E_\zeta(e_{n+1})$, then every consecutive pair of composite vertices $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_n)$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_{n+1})$ are distinct and this theorem holds as a direct consequence of Theorem 5. If for a given edge $e_n \in E(H)$ we have that $S_\zeta(\pi_o(e_n)) = S_\zeta(\pi_d(e_n))$, this means that $E_\zeta(e_n)$ is a self-loop. In this case, $E_\zeta(e_n)$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_{n+1})$ are dropped from W_ζ, eliminating the self-loop. If for a given pair of consecutive edges e_n, e_{n+1} we have that $E_\zeta(e_n) = E_\zeta(e_{n+1})$, then both $E_\zeta(e_n)$ and $E_\zeta(e_{n+1})$ are self-loops, so that $E_\zeta(e_n)$, $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_n$, $E_\zeta(e_{n+1})$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_{n+1})$ are dropped from W_ζ. Once all self-loops are removed from W_ζ, the remaining alternating sequence of composite vertices and edges is a walk on $M_\zeta(H)$ and therefore, this theorem holds. Note however, that W_ζ may be reduced to a single composite vertex and no edge. □

Since Theorem 7 holds for any given sub-determination, it also holds for the aggregated graph of H, since it is a special case of sub-determination.

3.5.2 Trail

We define a trail in a MAG H as a walk on H where all edges are distinct. Since all edges are distinct, we can identify a trail $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, e_1, \mathbf{u}_2, e_2, \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, e_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ with the MAG H_W = (A(W), E(W)), where $E(W) \subseteq E(H)$, $|A(W)| = |A(H)|$, and $A(W)[n] \subseteq A(H)[n]$ for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant p$, where $p = |A(W)|$ is the order of W. Therefore, the trail W is a sub-MAG of H.

Theorem 8. *A walk H_W on a MAG H is a trail on H if and only if there is a corresponding trail G_W on $g(H)$.*

Proof.

- $\Longrightarrow$
  Let H_W be a trail on H and let $g(H)$ be the composite vertices representation of H. Since H_W is a trail, it is also a walk. Hence, by Theorem 6, there is a corresponding walk G_W on $g(H)$. Since H_W is a trail on H, we have that all edges in H_W are distinct. From Corollary 1, there is a bijection $h : E(H) \rightarrow E(g(H))$ and, therefore, since the edges e_n in H_W are distinct, so are the corresponding edges in G_W. Since G_W is a walk on $g(H)$ and its edges are distinct, it follows that G_W is a trail on $g(H)$.

- $\Longleftarrow$
  Let G_W be a trail on $g(H)$, which is the composite vertices representation of a MAG H. Since G_W is also a walk on $g(H)$, by Theorem 6, there is a corresponding walk H_W on H. Since G_W is a trail, the edges in G_W are all distinct. Since by Corollary 1 there is a bijection $h : E(H) \rightarrow E(g(H))$, it follows that the corresponding edges in the walk H_W are also distinct. Therefore, since H_W is a walk and has distinct edges, it follows that H_W is a trail on the MAG H.

□

A trail is closed when the first and last composite vertices are the same, i.e. $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_k$, and open otherwise. A closed trail is also called a tour or a circuit.

From Theorem 7, we have that the projection of a trail W onto a sub-determined MAG $M_\zeta(H)$ is a walk. We intend to show that such projection of a trail does not necessarily lead to a trail on $M_\zeta(H)$. Consider the trail $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2), \mathbf{u}_2, (\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_3), \mathbf{u}_3, (\mathbf{u}_3, \mathbf{u}_4), \mathbf{u}_4, (\mathbf{u}_4, \mathbf{u}_5), \mathbf{u}_5]$, where all five composite nodes are distinct, but $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_4)$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_2) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_5)$. Since all composite nodes of W are distinct, all edges are necessarily distinct, and therefore, W is indeed a trail on the MAG H. Let's consider the projection onto M_ζ, $W_\zeta = [S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_2),$

$E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_2,\mathbf{u}_3)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_3), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_3,\mathbf{u}_4)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_4), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_4,\mathbf{u}_5)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_5)]$. Since $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_4)$ and $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_2) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_5)$, it follows that $E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_1,\mathbf{u}_2)) = E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_4,\mathbf{u}_5))$, and therefore, W_ζ is not a trail on M_ζ.

Since a trail is also a walk, the length of a trail is determined in the same way as the length of a walk, by the number of its edges. In particular, it follows from Corollary 2 that the length of a trail H_W on a MAG H is the same as the length of the corresponding trail G_W on $g(H)$, i.e. $Len(H_W) = Len(G_W)$.

3.5.3 Path

We define a path on a MAG H as a walk on H where all composite vertices are distinct. We can associate a path $P = [\mathbf{u}_1, e_1, \mathbf{u}_2, e_2, \mathbf{u}_3, ..., \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, e_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k]$ with the MAG H_P = (A(P), E(P)), where $E(P) \subseteq E(H)$, $|A(P)| = |A(H)|$, and $A(P)[n] \subseteq A(H)[n]$ for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant p$, where $p = |A(H)|$ is the order of H. Since all composite vertices in P are distinct, it follows that all edges in P are also distinct, because each edge in P is determined by the two composite vertices adjacent to it. Therefore, we have that the path P is a sub-MAG of H.

Theorem 9. *A walk P on H is a path on H if and only if there is a corresponding path G_P on $g(H)$.*

Proof. Since P is also a walk on H, we have from Theorem 6 that P is a walk on H if and only if G_P is a walk on $g(H)$. Therefore, the only point left to be shown is that all composite vertices in P are distinct if and only if all vertices in G_P are distinct. However, it also follows from Theorem 6 that the composite vertices in P and in G_P are the same. Therefore, the composite vertices of P are distinct if and only if the vertices of G_P are distinct, and the theorem holds. □

From Theorem 7, we have that the projection of a path W onto a sub-determined MAG $M_\zeta(H)$ is a walk. We intend to show that such projection of a path does not necessarily lead to a trail on $M_\zeta(H)$. Consider the path $W = [\mathbf{u}_1, (\mathbf{u}_1,\mathbf{u}_2), \mathbf{u}_2, (\mathbf{u}_2,\mathbf{u}_3), \mathbf{u}_3, (\mathbf{u}_3,\mathbf{u}_4), \mathbf{u}_4, (\mathbf{u}_4,\mathbf{u}_5), \mathbf{u}_5]$, where all five composite nodes are distinct, but $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_5)$. Since all composite nodes of W are distinct, W is a path on the MAG H. Let's consider the projection onto M_ζ, $W_\zeta = [S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_1,\mathbf{u}_2)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_2), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_2,\mathbf{u}_3)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_3), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_3,\mathbf{u}_4)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_4), E_\zeta((\mathbf{u}_4,\mathbf{u}_5)), S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_5)]$. Since $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_1) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_5)$, there is a repeated composite vertex in W_ζ, and therefore, W_ζ is not a path on M_ζ.

Since a path is also a walk, the length of the path is also determined by the number of edges on it. Further, it follows from Corollary 2 that the length of a path P on a MAG H is the same as the length of the corresponding path G_P on $g(H)$, i.e. $Len(P) = Len(G_P)$.

3.5.4 Cycle

A cycle on a MAG is defined as a closed path, i.e. a path that starts and ends on the same composite vertex.

Theorem 10. *A path P on a MAG H is a cycle if and only if the corresponding path G_P in $g(H)$ is a cycle.*

Proof. From Theorem 9, we have that P is a path on H if and only if G_P is a path on $g(H)$. Hence, we only need to show that P starts and ends on the same composite vertex if and only if G_P does the same. It follows from Theorem 6 that the sequence of composite vertices in P and in G_P is the same. Therefore, P starts and ends on a given composite vertex $\mathbf{u}$, if and only if G_P also does. Hence, the theorem holds. □

Additionally, since a cycle is a special case of a path, it follows that the length of a cycle is determined in the same way as the length of a path. Further, the length of a cycle P on H is the same as the length of the corresponding cycle G_P on $g(H)$.

We define the girth of a MAG H as the length of the shortest cycle in H. If H has no cycle, we consider that its girth is infinite. It follows directly from Theorem 10 and Corollary 2 that a MAG H and its composite vertices representation $g(H)$ have the same girth.

3.6 Shortest paths on a MAG

Before defining a shortest path in a MAG, we first present the concept of shortest walk. Given two distinct composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{u}_b \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ in a MAG H, such that there is at least one walk from $\mathbf{u}_a$ to $\mathbf{u}_b$, we define the shortest walk between $\mathbf{u}_a$ and $\mathbf{u}_b$ as the walk W_s from $\mathbf{u}_a$ to $\mathbf{u}_b$ such that no other walk from $\mathbf{u}_a$ to $\mathbf{u}_b$ is shorter than W_s. Note that a shortest walk between a given pair of distinct composite vertices is not necessarily unique.

Theorem 11. *A shortest walk W_s between a given pair of distinct composite vertices on a MAG is necessarily a path.*

Proof. (by contradiction)
Let H be a MAG of order p, $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_q \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ two distinct composite vertices in H, and $P = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_q]$ a shortest walk from $\mathbf{u}_1$ to $\mathbf{u}_q$ in H. We now assume that P is not a path (i.e. P has at least one repeated composite vertex). Then, there is (at least) a pair of composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k \in P$, such that $\mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{u}_k$, $j \neq k$, and $j < k$. In this case, $P_s = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_q]$ is a walk from $\mathbf{u}_1$ to $\mathbf{u}_q$ which is shorter than P. This is a contradiction, since P is a shortest walk from $\mathbf{u}_1$ to $\mathbf{u}_q$ in H.

Note that the same argument holds for particular cases, such as when $j = 1$ or $k = q$. We can therefore conclude that P is a path, and the theorem holds. □

Theorem 12. *A path P between two composite vertices* **u** *and* **v** *on a MAG H is a shortest path between these vertices if and only if the corresponding path G_P in $g(H)$ is a shortest path between the vertices* **u** *and* **v** *in $g(H)$.*

Proof.

- $\Longrightarrow$ (by contradiction)
  Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ be two composite vertices on a MAG H and P be a shortest path from **u** to **v**. Further, let G_P be the corresponding path from **u** to **v** on the graph $g(H)$. From Corollary 2, we have that $Len(P) = Len(G_P)$.
  Let's suppose that G_P is not a shortest path from **u** to **v** on $g(H)$. This means that there is a path G_{P_S} from **u** to **v** on $g(H)$, such that $Len(G_{P_S}) < Len(G_P)$. Then, by Theorem 9 and Corollary 2, there must be a corresponding path P_S from **u** to **v** on H, such that $Len(P_S) < Len(P)$. This is a contradiction, since P is a shortest path from **u** to **v** on H. Therefore, G_P is a shortest path from **u** to **v** on $g(H)$.

- $\Longleftarrow$ (by contradiction)
  Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in V(g(H))$ be two vertices on $g(H)$ and G_P be a shortest path from **u** to **v**. Further, let P be the corresponding path from **u** to **v** on the MAG H. From Corollary 2, we have that $Len(G_P) = Len(P)$.
  Let's suppose that P is not a shortest path from **u** to **v** on MAG H. Then, there must be a path P_S from **u** to **v** in H, such that $Len(P_S) < Len(P)$. Thus, from Theorem 9 and Corollary 2, there must be a corresponding path G_{P_S} from **u** to **v** on $g(H)$, such that $Len(G_{P_S}) < Len(G_P)$. This is a contradiction, since G_P is a shortest path from **u** to **v** on $g(H)$. Therefore, P is a shortest path from **u** to **v** on the MAG H.

□

3.7 Weak shortest path

We define a weak shortest path on a MAG as a shortest path for which the starting or the ending composite vertex is sub-determined. Note that there are three distinct ways by which a shortest path may be weak: (i) if the origin composite vertex of the path is sub-determined; (ii) if the destination composite vertex is sub-determined; and (iii) if both the origin and the destination composite vertices are sub-determined.

A weak shortest path is in fact a shortest path between two composite vertices. The point is that in a weak shortest path a sub-determined composite vertex can be substituted by any composite vertex belonging to the same equivalence class of the

original one. As stated in Section 2.2.1, two composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_a$ and $\mathbf{u}_b$ belong to a same equivalence class if $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$.

Theorem 13. *Given a MAG H of order p, a pair of distinct composite vertices $\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{u}_b \in \mathbb{V}(H)$, a shortest path $P_s : \mathbf{u}_a \to \mathbf{u}_b$, and a sub-determination ζ, then there is a weak shortest path $P\zeta_s : S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a) \to S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$, such that $Len(P\zeta_s) \leqslant Len(P_s)$.*

Proof. Let $P_s : \mathbf{u}_a \to \mathbf{u}_b$ be a shortest path on a MAG H of order p. Note that P_s is also a path from $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a)$ to $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$. Therefore, there is a path $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a) \to S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$ with length $Len(P_s)$, and if this is a shortest path, we are done. It remains to be shown that there can be a path $P\zeta_s : S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a) \to S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$ that is strictly shorter than P_s. So, without loss of generality, let's assume that $P_s = [\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{u}_b]$. If for any j, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ we have that $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_j)$, then the path $P\zeta_j : S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_j) \to S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$ is a path $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_a) \to S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$ such that $Len(P\zeta_j) < Len(P_s)$. Note that a similar argument can be used for the case where for any k, $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n$ we have that $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_k)$. □

Theorem 14. *The composition of two weak shortest paths in a MAG H is not necessarily a shortest path in H.*

Proof. Let H be a MAG, $\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{u}_b, \mathbf{u}_c \in \mathbb{V}(H)$ three composite vertices in H, and $P_{W_1} : \mathbf{u}_a \to S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$, $P_{W_2} : S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b) \to \mathbf{u}_c$ two weak shortest paths in H. For simplicity, let's assume that there is only a single path $P_W : \mathbf{u}_a \to \mathbf{u}_c$, and that $P_{W_1} \subset P_W$ and $P_{W_2} \subset P_W$, meaning that both P_{W_1} and P_{W_2} are subpaths of P_W. Note that P_W is also the single shortest path from $\mathbf{u}_a$ to $\mathbf{u}_c$.

Since P_{W_1} is a weak shortest path, we have that in fact $P_{W_1} : \mathbf{u}_a \to \mathbf{u}_b^*$, where $S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b^*) = S_\zeta(\mathbf{u}_b)$. i.e. $\mathbf{u}_b^*$ is one possible sub-determination of $\mathbf{u}_b$. In the same way, we have that $P_{W_2} : \mathbf{u}_b^{**} \to \mathbf{u}_c$, so that $\mathbf{u}_b^{**}$ is also a possible sub-determination of $\mathbf{u}_b$.

The composition $P_{W_1} + P_{W_2}$ can be a walk only if $\mathbf{u}_b^* = \mathbf{u}_b^{**}$, in which case $P_W = P_{W_1} + P_{W_2}$. In the case where $\mathbf{u}_b^* \neq \mathbf{u}_b^{**}$, $P_{W_1} + P_{W_2}$ is not a walk and also $Len(P_W) > Len(P_{W_1}) + Len(P_{W_2})$. □

3.8 Distances on MAGs

In order to properly formalize distance notions on MAGs, we recall the definition of metric and some of its extensions. A metric on a given set X is defined as a function $d : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \bigcup \{0\}$, such that for all $x, y, z \in X$ the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $d(x,y) \geqslant 0$,
2. $d(x,y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$,

3. $d(x,y) = d(y,x)$,

4. $d(x,z) \leqslant d(x,y) + d(y,z)$.

A quasimetric on a given set X is defined in a similar way, but property 3, regarding symmetry, is dropped. A semimetric, on its turn, is defined also in a similar way, but without the triangular inequality (item 4 of the metric definition). Finally, we have a premetric, which is defined without the symmetry and triangular inequality properties, i.e. items 3 and 4 of the metric definition, respectively.

It can be seen that for a traditional undirected graph with unweighted (or positive weighted) edges distances between vertices are a metric. Properties 1 and 2 follow from the edges having positive values, property 3 follows from the graph being undirected, and therefore symmetric. Property 4 follows from the fact that there is a shortest path from x to y and an other from y to z. Concatenating these two paths, we get a path from x to z of length $d(x,y) + d(y,z)$. Therefore, the distance between x and z can only be equal or less than $d(x,y) + d(y,z)$.

We now define the distance between a pair of composite vertices $(\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{u}_b)$ on a MAG as the length of the shortest path from vertex $\mathbf{u}_a$ to vertex $\mathbf{u}_b$, or infinite if there is no walk from vertex $\mathbf{u}_a$ to vertex $\mathbf{u}_b$. From this definition, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 15. *The distance between composite vertices on a MAG where edges are unweighted is a metric or a quasimetric.*

Proof. From Theorem 12, we have that the distance between a pair of composite vertices on a MAG H is equal to the distance between the same composite vertices on $g(H)$. Since $g(H)$ is a traditional graph, it follows that if $g(H)$ is unoriented, then distances satisfy all four properties stated above. If $g(H)$ is directed all but property 3 (symmetry) are satisfied. Therefore, the theorem follows. □

As we also have a weak definition for shortest paths (see Section 3.7), we can also define a distance notion based on it. This leads to the definition of weak distance, where at least one of the vertices is sub-determined. From this definition, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 16. *The weak distance on a MAG is a semimetric or a premetric.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 14 that the triangular inequality not necessarily holds for weak distances. Therefore, a weak distance is either a semimetric (for a symmetric MAG) or a premetric (for an asymmetric MAG). □

As a consequence of Theorem 16, some distance notions found in the literature of time-varying [15] or multilayer [16] graphs, which are based on paths between sub-defined vertices, are not metrics but rather semimetrics or premetrics, for which the triangular inequality can not be assumed to hold.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we have formalized the MultiAspect Graph (MAG) concept and have proved that a MAG is isomorphic to a traditional directed graph. This leads to an important theoretical framework because this allows the use of the isomorphic directed graph as a tool to analyze both the properties of a MAG and the behavior of dynamic processes over a MAG. Further, we have also demonstrated that other key properties of MAG, such as adjacency, walks, trails, and paths, are also closely related to their counterparts in a traditional graph, therefore allowing applications based on MAGs to be analyzed with the help of directed graph arguments. Further, since a MAG can also be considered a particular case of even uniform hypergraph, the theory developed for this class of hypergraphs can also be applied to MAGs.

The MAG concept thus enables the modelling of networked objects with characteristics similar to traditional graphs, but that simultaneously also present some dependency on other *aspects*, such as layers and/or time. Since the MAG structure admits an arbitrary (finite) number of aspects, it hence introduces a powerful modelling abstraction for networked complex systems. In this context, the time-varying graphs discussed in our previous work [12] shall hereafter be considered as order 2 MAGs.

In particular, the results on the isomorphism of a MAG with a traditional directed graph (Section 3.2) enable the modeling of multilayer and time-varying networks in the form of traditional directed graphs. Moreover, the results concerning adjacency, walks, paths, and trails on MAGs (see Sections 3.4 and 3.5) allow the building of new algorithms based on Breadth-First Search (BFS) and Depth-First Search (DFS) on traditional directed graphs to derive results for MAGs. These new MAG algorithms should take into account the differences between a MAG and a traditional directed graph. The investigation of such new algorithms is our intent for future work. However, based upon preliminary results, we are confident that such algorithms shall have complexity similar to the obtained for traditional directed graphs, i.e. if the algorithm is derived from a given algorithm which is polynomial for traditional graphs, the resulting algorithm for MAGs will be polynomial in the size of the composite vertices representation of the MAG.

As hinted by the nature of the edges on a MAG and their relation to an even uniform hypergraph, an algebraic MAG representation is possible by means of high

order tensors. A possible way to obtain such a representation is by using an order $2p$ tensor for building an adjacency tensor for an order p MAG. Therefore, previous results on even uniform hypergraphs [17, 18, 19, 20] can be used on the analysis of MAGs. Nevertheless, due to the MAG isomorphism to a directed traditional graph, it is also possible to obtain algebraic MAG representations in matrix form. The detailed analysis of such representations are, however, beyond the scope of this particular work and are also the target of our future work.

Acknowledgment

This work was partially funded by the Brazilian funding agencies CAPES, CNPq, FINEP, and FAPERJ as well as the Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovation (MCTI).

References

[1] R. Distel, Graph Theory, 4th Edition, Springer, 2010.

[2] P. Erdös, On extremal problems of graphs and generalized graphs, Israel Journal of Mathematics 2 (3) (1964) 183–190.

[3] B. Bollobás, On generalized graphs, Acta Mathematica Hungarica 16 (3-4) (1965) 447 – 452.

[4] V. Chvatal, Hypergraphs and Ramseyian Theorems, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 27 (3) (1971) 434. doi:10.2307/2036470.

[5] M. Kurant, P. Thiran, Layered Complex Networks, Physical Review Letters 96 (13) (2006) 138701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.138701.

[6] P. J. Mucha, T. Richardson, K. Macon, M. A. Porter, J.-P. Onnela, Community structure in time-dependent, multiscale, and multiplex networks., Science 328 (5980) (2010) 876–8. doi:10.1126/science.1184819.

[7] M. De Domenico, A. Solé-Ribalta, E. Cozzo, M. Kivelä, Y. Moreno, M. Porter, S. Gómez, A. Arenas, Mathematical Formulation of Multilayer Networks, Physical Review X 3 (4) (2013) 041022. doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.3.041022.

[8] S. Gómez, a. Díaz-Guilera, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, C. J. Pérez-Vicente, Y. Moreno, a. Arenas, Diffusion Dynamics on Multiplex Networks, Physical Review Letters 110 (2) (2013) 028701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.028701.

[9] A. Casteigts, P. Flocchini, W. Quattrociocchi, N. Santoro, Time-varying graphs and dynamic networks, International Journal of Parallel, Emergent and Distributed Systems 27 (5) (2012) 387–408. doi:10.1080/17445760.2012.668546.

[10] P. Holme, J. Saramäki, Temporal networks, Physics Reports 519 (3) (2012) 97–125. doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2012.03.001.

[11] P. Holme, J. Saramäki (Eds.), Temporal Networks, Springer, 2013.

[12] K. Wehmuth, A. Ziviani, E. Fleury, A Unifying Model for Representing Time-Varying Graphs, Technical Report RR-8466, INRIA (Feb. 2014).
URL http://hal.inria.fr/hal-00941622

[13] M. Kivelä, A. Arenas, M. Barthelemy, J. P. Gleeson, Y. Moreno, M. A. Porter, Multilayer networks, Journal of Complex Networks (2014) 1–69. doi:10.1093/comnet/cnu016.

[14] S. Hu, L. Qi, Algebraic connectivity of an even uniform hypergraph, Journal of Combinatorial Optimization 24 (4) (2011) 564–579. doi:10.1007/s10878-011-9407-1.

[15] H. Wu, J. Cheng, S. Huang, Y. Ke, Y. Lu, Y. Xu, Path Problems in Temporal Graphs, Proceedings of the VLDB, 7 (9) (2014) 721–732.

[16] V. Nicosia, G. Bianconi, V. Latora, M. Barthelemy, Growing Multiplex Networks, Physical Review Letters 111 (5) (2013) 058701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.058701.

[17] Q. Zhu, The largest transversal numbers of uniform hypergraphs, Discrete Mathematics 147 (1–3) (1995) 271–282. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(94)00245-E.

[18] J. Lehel, The partition of a uniform hypergraph into pairs of dependent hyperedges, Discrete Mathematics 163 (1–3) (1997) 313–318. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(95)00322-N.

[19] R. F. Bailey, B. Stevens, Hamiltonian decompositions of complete k-uniform hypergraphs, Discrete Mathematics 310 (22) (2010) 3088–3095. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2009.03.047.

[20] S. Hu, L. Qi, The eigenvectors associated with the zero eigenvalues of the Laplacian and signless Laplacian Discrete Applied Mathematics 169 (2014) 140–151. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2013.12.024.